

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ROY A. LAUES and KRISTEN
G. LAUES,

Plaintiffs,

Case No: 13-12468
Hon. Victoria A. Roberts

vs

BANK OF AMERICA N.A., et al,

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on several motions filed by Plaintiffs:

(1) The Court treats (A) Plaintiffs' "Motion for Finding of Facts and Conclusions of Law to Plaintiffs Motion to Remand to the Third Circuit Court of Wayne County Michigan" in Document 11, and (B) Plaintiffs' "Amended Motion for Finding of Facts and Conclusions of Law to Plaintiffs Motion to Remand," Document 12, as motions for reconsideration of this Court's June 20, 2013 Order, Document 10.

Local Rule 7.1(h)(3) provides the Court's standard of review:

Generally, and without restricting the court's discretion, the court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication. The movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties and other persons entitled to be heard on the motion have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.

E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(h)(3).

Palpable defects are those which are "obvious, clear, unmistakable, manifest or

plain." *Mich. Dep't of Treasury v. Michalec*, 181 F. Supp. 2d 731, 734 (E.D. Mich. 2002).

"It is an exception to the norm for the Court to grant a motion for reconsideration."

Maiberger v. City of Livonia, 724 F. Supp. 2d 759, 780 (E.D. Mich. 2010). "[A]bsent a significant error that changes the outcome of a ruling on a motion, the Court will not provide a party with an opportunity to relitigate issues already decided." *Id.*

The Court finds that Plaintiffs' arguments do not demonstrate palpable defects which if corrected would result in a different disposition of the Court's order. Plaintiffs' motions for reconsideration are **DENIED**.

(2) Plaintiffs' "Motion Objecting to Defendants Filing Extension" within Document 11 is **DENIED AS MOOT**; this issue was ruled upon by the Court in its June 20, 2013 Order.

(3) The Court **GRANTS** Plaintiffs' "Motion in the Alternative for Plaintiff (sic) Enlargement 30 Day Extention (sic) to Amend Complaint" within Document 11; Plaintiffs must amend their complaint by **July 30, 2013**.

The parties are prohibited from filing motions until further order of the Court.

A telephone conference will be held on **August 1, 2013, at 11:30 AM**.

IT IS ORDERED.

S/Victoria A. Roberts

Victoria A. Roberts

United States District Judge

Dated: July 17, 2013

The undersigned certifies that a copy of this document was served on the attorneys of record and Roy A. Laues and Kristen G. Laues by electronic means or U.S. Mail on July 17, 2013.

S/Carol A. Pinegar

Deputy Clerk